

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-30 were presented for examination and were rejected.

The applicants have amended claims 14, 15, and 24 in order to correct the antecedent problems that were raised as part of claims objections.

The applicants have also amended claims 1, 2, 18, 19, 22-25, and 27, either to improve the readability of the claims or to establish consistency in the usage of certain terms.

Claims 24, 25, and 28 used the "said" convention for introducing previously-introduced limitations. Those claims have been amended to switch to the "the" convention because it is more easily read and comprehended. No substantive change in the scope of the claims is desired or intended by this change.

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the amendments and the following comments.

Claim Objections

Claims 14, 15, and 24 were objected to because of antecedent problems.

The applicants have amended the objected-to claims in order to correct the dependency of the claims, thereby correcting the antecedent problems as well. For this reason, the applicants respectfully submit that the objections are overcome.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection of Claims 1-15, 19, 22, and 25-30

Claims 1-15, 19, 22, and 25-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wojtacki et al, U.S. Patent 6,511,348 (hereinafter "Wojtacki"). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites:

1. A modular electrical jack connector system comprising:

i) a first inside jack connector housing (100) having a first side and a second side that face opposite to each other, ii) a first outside jack connector housing (101) interconnected with the first inside jack connector housing (100) at the first side, and iii) a second outside jack connector housing (102) interconnected with the first inside jack connector housing (100) at the second side; and

a jack connector-subassembly (200) inserted into each of the jack connector housings (100, 101, 102);

wherein the jack connector housings (100, 101, 102) are configured as an assembly of modular adjacent connector housings that are arranged in a row; and

wherein each of the jack connector housings (100, 101, 102) comprises i) a front coupling side having at least two openings (110, 111) which openings (110, 111) are disposed one above the other for the purpose of receiving a plurality of electrical plug connectors through the front coupling side and ii) a rear side (112) for the purpose of inserting the jack connector subassembly (200), the rear side being oppositely disposed with respect to the front coupling side; and

wherein each jack connector subassembly (200) comprises a longitudinal strip-like carrier (250) having a substantially right-angled profile and having on the top and on the bottom respectively a series of extrusion-coated or injection-molded jack terminals (260), wherein the extrusion-coated or injection-molded jack terminals (260) embody at a front end of the strip-like carrier uncoated and bent-back cantilevered contact portions (265, 266), and wherein the uncoated and bent-back cantilevered contact portions (265, 266) are disposed aligned in an upper opening (110) and/or into a lower opening (111) of the jack connector housing (100, 101, 102).

(emphasis supplied)

Nowhere does Wojtacki teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what claim 1 recites — namely that the jack connector housings are configured as an assembly of modular adjacent connector housings that are arranged in a row.

As can be clearly seen in Figure 1 of Wojtacki, and in contrast to what the Office is arguing, jack connector housing 6 is not configured as an assembly of modular connector housings that are arranged adjacently in a row. Rather, housing 6 of Wojtacki is a single, "main housing member."

For this reason, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 is traversed.

Because claims 2-15, 19, and 22 depend on claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of them is also traversed.

Independent claim 27 recites:

27. A jack connector housing (100) for a modular electrical jack connector system, the jack connector housing (100) comprising:

a first side and a second side that face opposite to each other, wherein the first side and the second side are adapted to interconnect with a first additional jack connector housing (101) and a second additional jack connector housing (102), respectively;

a front coupling side having at least two openings (110, 111) which openings (110, 111) are disposed one above the other for the purpose of receiving a plurality of electrical plug connectors through the front coupling side; and

a rear side (112) for the purpose of inserting a jack connector subassembly (200), the rear side being oppositely disposed with respect to the front coupling side;

wherein the jack connector housing is modularly arrangeable in a row with and adjacent to at least the first additional jack connector housing.

(emphasis supplied)

Nowhere does Wojtacki teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what claim 27 recites — namely that *the jack connector housing is modularly arrangeable in a row with and adjacent to at least one additional jack connector housing.*

For the reasons discussed above and with respect to claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 27 is traversed.

Independent claim 28 recites:

28. A jack connector subassembly (200) for a modular electrical jack connector system, the jack connector subassembly (200) comprising a longitudinal strip-like carrier (250) comprising a substantially right-angled profile and *having on the top and on the bottom respectively a series of extrusion-coated or injection-molded jack terminals (260)* which extrusion-coated or injection-molded jack terminals (260) embody at a front end of the strip-like carrier uncoated and bent back cantilevered contact portions (265, 256) which uncoated and bent back cantilevered contact portions (265, 256) are alignable in an upper opening (110) and/or in a lower opening (111) of a jack connector housing.

(emphasis supplied)

Nowhere does Wojtacki teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what claim 28 recites — namely a strip-like carrier having on the top and on the bottom respectively *a series of extrusion-coated or injection-molded jack terminals.*

The Office action states in the middle of the first paragraph of page 3 that terminals 28 of Wojtacki are extrusion-coated or injection-molded. However, it can be

clearly seen, for example, in Figure 9 of Wojtacki that terminals 28 are placed or inserted into the respective passages of slots 201-208. Hence, the jack connector assembly 4 of Wojtacki cannot possibly comprise jack terminals that are extrusion-coated or injection-molded.

For these reasons, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 28 is traversed.

Independent claim 29 recites:

29. A longitudinal strip-like carrier (250) comprising a substantially right-angled profile and having on the top and on the bottom respectively a series of extrusion-coated or injection-molded jack terminals which extrusion-coated or injection-molded jack terminals embody at a front end of the strip-like carrier uncoated and bent back cantilevered contact portions particularly for a modular electrical jack connector system.

(emphasis supplied)

Nowhere does Wojtacki teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what claim 29 recites — namely a strip-like carrier having on the top and on the bottom respectively a series of extrusion-coated or injection-molded jack terminals.

For the reasons discussed above and with respect to claim 28, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 29 is traversed.

Because claim 30 depends on claim 29, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 30 is also traversed.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claims 16-18

Claims 16-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Wojtacki in view of Boutros, U.S. Patent 5,741,152 (hereinafter "Boutros").

Because claims 16-18 depend on claim 1 and because Boutros fails to cure the deficiencies of Wojtacki with respect to the rejection of claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 16-18 is also traversed.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claims 20-21

Claims 20-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Wojtacki in view of De Young et al., U.S. Patent 5,269,708 (hereinafter "De Young").

Because claims 20-21 depend on claim 19 and because De Young fails to cure the deficiencies of Wojtacki with respect to the rejection of claim 19, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 20-21 is also traversed.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claims 23-24

Claims 23-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Wojtacki.

Because claims 23-24 depend on claim 22, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 23-24 is also traversed.

Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the last Office action, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are remaining issues, the applicants respectfully request that Examiner telephone the applicants' agent so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Respectfully,
Stephan Steinke et al.

By /Kenneth Ottesen/
Kenneth Ottesen
Reg. No. 54353
732-578-0103 x222

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.
Suite 250
100 Commons Way
Holmdel, NJ 07733
United States of America